

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 02-4381

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

JACQUELINE DIANE GOODING,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Richard L. Williams, Senior District Judge. (CR-00-234-3)

Submitted: January 8, 2003

Decided: January 30, 2003

Before NIEMEYER, MOTZ, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Craig W. Sampson, LAW OFFICE OF CRAIG W. SAMPSON, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellant. Sara Elizabeth Flannery, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Jacqueline Diane Gooding pled guilty to conspiracy to launder money, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1956(h) (2000). Gooding filed a motion to correct sentence, and the district court denied the motion. Counsel has filed a brief in accordance with Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), arguing the district court based Gooding's sentence on an improperly calculated amount of value under U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual § 2S1.1 (2000) but stating that in his view, there were no meritorious issues for appeal. Advised of her right to file a pro se supplemental brief, Gooding has not done so. We have reviewed the Appellant's brief and record, and assuming without deciding that Gooding's motion to correct sentence was properly before the court, we find no error in the district court's denial of the motion.

As required by Anders, we have reviewed the record and find no meritorious issues for appeal. Accordingly, we affirm. This court requires that counsel inform his client, in writing, of her right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If the client requests that a petition be filed, but counsel believes that such a petition would be frivolous, then counsel may move in this court for leave to withdraw from representation. Counsel's motion must state that a copy thereof was served on the client.

We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED